IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: Mark A. Clarner	Art Unit	: 3677
Serial No.	: 10/688,320	Examiner	: Robert John Sandy
Filed	: October 15, 2003	Conf. No.	: 8855
Title	: MULTIPLE-CROOK MALE TOUCH FASTENER ELEMENTS		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Applicant is responding to the Examiner's answer, mailed November 9, 2006, to the amended appeal brief mailed October 11, 2006. After further consideration and in light of the additional explanation in the Examiner's answer, Applicant withdraws claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 15, 24-27, 30, 31, 34, 45-47, 51, 53, 60, 65, 66, 76, 77 from the appeal. However, Applicant maintains the appeal with respect to the final rejection of claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 28, 32, 33, 35-37, 48-50, 52, 54, 55, 61-64, 67, 68, 78, and 79 in the Final Office Action dated December 7, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be reversed with respect to the maintained claims.

A Pre-Appeal Request for Review, along with a Notice of Appeal and the required fee was filed April 7, 2006. The Panel's decision was mailed May 10, 2006 maintaining the rejection of all of the claims.

(1) STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 5-17, 24-28, 30-37, 45-55, 60-68 and 76-79 are pending.

Claims 1, 27, 48 and 61 are in independent form.

Claims 4, 18-23, 29, 38-44, 56-59, 69-75 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 27, 48 and 61 have been previously amended.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 15, 24-27, 30, 31, 34, 45-47, 51, 53, 60, 65, 66, 76, 77 are withdrawn from the appeal and will be canceled upon allowance of the remaining claims.

Applicant requests that this appeal now proceed with respect to claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 28, 32, 33, 35-37, 48-50, 52, 54, 55, 61-64, 67, 68, 78, and 79.

(2) GROUNDS OF REJECTION

(A) Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-13, 15-17, 25-28, 31-34, 36, 37, 46-49, 51-55, 61-63, 65-68 and 76-79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Akeno, U.S. Patent No. 5,781,969 ("Akeno").

(B) Claims 5, 14, 24, 30, 45, 50, 60 and 64 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Akeno.

(C) Claims 24, 45 and 60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Akeno in view of Romanko, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,371 ("Romanko").

(D) Claims 10 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Akeno in view of Takizawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,537,720 ("Takizawa").

(3) ARGUMENT

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's statements regarding the appeal brief summary and submits that the summary provided in the appeal brief correctly summarizes the claimed subject matter.

(A) Claims 3, 7, 8, 11, 16, 17, 28, 32, 33, 36, 37, 48, 49, 52, 54, 55, 61-63, 67, 68, 78, and 79 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Akeno.

Claims 3, 28, 49 and 63 require, in pertinent part, a fastener element having an overall length (L) between opposite extents of the heads, measured parallel to the base, of at least 1.8 times the overall height (A) of the fastener element. Applicant submits that the Examiner improperly relies on scaling of unscaled patent drawings and/or improper inferences derived from such drawings. The Federal Circuit has held that patent drawings are not drawn to scale, and that the size of patent drawings cannot be used to establish anticipation of a claim limitation relating to size.[1] Akeno fails to provide sufficient information to calculate a ratio of overall length to overall height of the fastener element, at least in that Akeno fails to provide a clear overall length dimension, and therefore does not anticipate any of claims 3, 28, 49 and 63.

Claim 48 requires, in pertinent part, a ratio of an overall length (L) of the fastener element to a height (G) of a lowermost extent of the well that is greater than 2.5 (i.e., $L/G > 2.5$). Again, the Examiner's conclusion is based solely on improper scaling of patent drawings in contradiction of established case law. Akeno fails to provide sufficient information to calculate a ratio of overall length to height of a lowermost extent of a well of a fastener element, at least in that Akeno fails to provide a clear overall length dimension, and therefore does not anticipate claim 48 or any of the claims that depend therefrom.

Likewise, with respect to claims 7 and 32, reciting, in pertinent part, a ratio (L/G) including an overall length (L) of the fastener element, Applicant submits that the Examiner improperly relies on scaling of unscaled patent drawings and/or improper inferences derived from such drawings.

---

[1] *See Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc.,* 793 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Intl., Inc.*, 222 F.3d 951 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *see also*, MPEP 2125 stating "proportions of features in a drawing are not evidence of actual proportions when drawings are not to scale."

Again, with respect to claims 8, 33, 52, 61, and 62, which require, in pertinent part, that each fastener element have a mold release factor that is less than 0.1 (i.e., MRF < 0.1), Applicant submits that the Examiner improperly relies on scaling of unscaled patent drawings and/or improper inferences derived from such drawings. Akeno fails to provide or define either a minimum solid length of the fastener stem, or a maximum solid length of the fastener stem. Therefore, the Akeno reference cannot be used to calculate a MRF for the Akeno's fastener elements from the information provided and cannot be used to anticipate a claimed ratio including such parameters. Furthermore, Akeno fails to even appreciate the significance of the concept denoted by the term "mold release factor." Applicant respectfully submits that the aforementioned claims, and all claims that depend therefrom, are novel over Akeno.Claim 11 requires, in pertinent part, that the lower surfaces of the heads are arched. Akeno discloses a fastener with heads that extend upward from the stem of the fastener element. Akeno fails to disclose a fastener element with heads having lower surfaces that define an arch, as that term would be clearly understood by those of ordinary skill in this art. For at least this reason, claim 11 is not anticipated by Akeno.

Claims 16, 36, 54, and 67 require, in pertinent part, crooks overhanging surfaces of the stem. Akeno discloses a fastener element having heads extending upward from a stem of the fastener element, which has vertical surfaces (normal to the base). However, Akeno fails to disclose a fastener with crooks, let alone one with crooks overhanging surfaces of the stem. Applicant maintains that the Examiner has taken a broader view of the term "overhang" than one of ordinary skill would have in view of Applicant's specification. Applicant uses the term in a manner consistent with dictionary definitions, such as "to project over something that lies beneath," for example as Applicant's Fig. 3 shows the crooks *overhanging* the sloped surfaces of the stem.[2]

Similarly, with respect to claims 17, 37, 55, and 68, Akeno neither discloses a fastener with crooks overhanging surfaces of a stem, nor stem surfaces that extend at an angle of inclination between about 20 and 30 degrees with respect to a *normal* to the base. Examiner contends that an angle theta disclosed in Akeno provides a similar angle of inclination.

---

[2] American Heritage College Dictionary, 3rd Ed.

However, Akeno defines angle theta with respect to a flat surface on the engaging head and a *horizontal* plane (col. 10, line 32), rather than a *vertical* plane *normal* to the base. As a result, Akeno fails to disclose the claimed angle of inclination of the stem surface.

(B) Claims 14, 50, and 64 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akeno.

Claim 14 requires, in pertinent part, that the stem have opposing surfaces defined by severed resin. Claim 14 is thus directed toward a fastener element having a stem with surfaces characterized as of a severed resin structure, rather than of a molded structure. Those of ordinary skill in the art will understand the differences between a molded resin surface and a severed resin surface, and be readily able to distinguish such surfaces in fastener element stems. Applicant is clearly reciting a structural characteristic of the resin surface of the stem, not a product formed by the process of severing. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 14 is non-obvious over Akeno for at least the reason that Akeno fails to disclose, suggest, or enable a fastener element having a stem with severed resin surfaces. Rather, Akeno's fastener element stems appear to only have molded surfaces, and Akeno provides no enabling disclosure as to how to sever, rather than mold, those surfaces. Moreover, Akeno provides no motivation for one of ordinary skill to modify his method and resulting product to have severed surfaces.

Claim 50 depends from claim 48. Claim 48 requires, in pertinent part, a ratio of an overall length (L) of the fastener element to a height (G) of a lowermost extent of the well that is greater than 2.5 (i.e., $L/G > 2.5$). Claim 50 requires, in pertinent part, a ratio of an overall height of each crook (C), measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip to an uppermost extent of the crook, to an entrance height (E) measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base below a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip, that is greater than 0.6. Applicant submits that the ratio L/G (overall length of the fastener element to well height) greater than 0.6 and the ratio C/E (overall height of each crook to entrance height) greater than 2.5 are not arbitrary, but rather a non-obvious combination of ratios that provides an improved fastener element with good performance properties (as noted on page 8 of the application) such as higher cycle life, improved fastening performance with low loft loops, and

improved loop retention.[3] In cases where the results of optimizing a result effective variable were unexpectedly good, the parameter optimized was neither recognized as a result-effective variable nor obvious.[4] Furthermore, Akeno fails to disclose or define a lowermost extent of a tip of a head of the fastener element or an uppermost extent of a cook, which are both required for calculating a crook height. The head of the fastener element disclosed in Akeno extends upwardly from the stem with no ascertainable cook or lowermost extent of a tip. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 50 is non-obvious over Akeno for at least the reason that Akeno does not disclose, suggest, or enable the claimed combination of L/G and C/E ratios and does not even provide a fastener structure that allows a calculation of the aforementioned ratios.

Claim 64 depends from claim 61. Claim 61 requires, in pertinent part, a mold release factor ("MRF"), defined as a ratio of a difference between a minimum solid length of the stem, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view, and a maximum solid length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view above an elevation corresponding to the minimum solid length, to the minimum solid length of the stem, of less than 0.1. Applicant discloses at page 14, lines 25-28 that "maintaining a low mold release factor, such as below 0.1, helps removing the molded fastener elements" and it also helps "prevent mold fouling and wear and decreases permanent distention of the hook heads." Akeno does not disclose or even suggest a MRF, nor does Akeno appear to even appreciate the significance of the concept denoted by the term MRF. Akeno fails to provide or define either a minimum solid length of the fastener stem, or a maximum solid length of the fastener stem. Therefore, the Akeno reference cannot even be used to calculate a MRF for the Akeno's fastener elements from

---

[3] In *Ex Parte Buchanan,* the Examiner rejected claims to a package convertible into a serving bowl, which recited sides of no less than twice the width of the bottom of the package. There, the claimed relationship between two recited variables was not found in the prior art, but the examiner rejected the claims under §103, citing *In re Rose* and concluding that a mere change in the height of the walls would have been obvious. The Board reversed the rejection, finding that "the modification suggested by the Examiner to meet the claimed ratio would involve modification of one dimension relative to another," namely, the walls to the bottom, and that the Examiner could not supply the missing characteristic by characterizing it as mere 'design choice.' The Board noted that the relationship or ratio between the recited two variables was not arbitrary but rather, as is the case here, was discovered to solve a stated problem. Appeal No. 2000-0522, 2000 WL 33301735 (B.P.A.I. 2000).

[4] *See Bird Provision Co. v. Owens Country Sausage, Inc.*, 568 F.2d 369, 378 (5th Cir. 1978).

the information contained therein. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Akeno fails to disclose, suggest, or enable a mold release factor of less than 0.1.

Claim 64 requires, in pertinent part, a ratio of an overall height of each crook, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip to an uppermost extent of the crook, to an entrance height measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base below a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip, that is greater than 0.6. As described above, Akeno fails to disclose or define a lowermost extent of a tip of a head of the fastener element or an uppermost extent of a cook, which are both required for calculating a crook height. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 64 is non-obvious over Akeno for at least the reasons that it depend from a non-obvious base claim and that Akeno does not disclose, suggest, or enable the claimed C/E ratio (overall height of each crook to entrance height).

(C) Applicant's appeal of the rejection of claims 24, 45 and 60 is withdrawn.

(D) Claims 10 and 35 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akeno in view of Takizawa.

Claims 10 and 35 require that the tips of the heads extend toward the base. Claim 10 also requires, in pertinent part from claim 1, a height of a lowermost extent of the well, measured from and perpendicular to the sheet-form base, that is less than 60 percent of an overall height of the fastener element, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base. Claim 35 also requires, in pertinent part from claim 27, a ratio of an overall height of at least one of the heads, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the tip to an uppermost extent of the head, to a height of a lowermost extent of the well, measured from and perpendicular to the sheet-form base, that is greater than 0.7. Takizawa does not disclose even a single dimension for his fastener elements. Rather, Takizawa is only cited as disclosing fastener elements having tips extending toward a base. However, it is axiomatic that obviousness cannot be established by using the Applicants' application as a template to fit together independent pieces of prior art.[5] Accordingly, claims are not disjointed lists of elements, but present an invention that must be

[5] *See e.g. Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132; *Loctite Corp. v. Ultraseal Ltd.*; 781 F.2d 861; and *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071.

considered as a whole.[6] There is no motivation disclosed in either reference to combine Takizawa with Akeno, to provide a fastener element of Akeno's dimensions but with Takizawa's fastener element shape, and neither reference suggests that even if one of ordinary skill were to be motivated to change the shape of Akeno's elements, that the revised shape would continue to have the relevant ratios of dimensions from Akeno's disclosed shape and upon which the Examiner relies in the rejection. Applicant respectfully maintains that claims 10 and 35 are non-obvious over the combination of Akeno and Takizawa for at least the reason that there is no motivation or suggestion in either reference for combining the references as the Examiner proposes, or that such a combination would have resulted in Applicant's invention.

[6] *See e.g.* MPEP 2141.02; and *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip*, 713 F.2d 1530.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims remaining under appeal are patentable over the cited art, for at least the reasons outlined above. It is not believed that any other charges are due, but please apply any such charges to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 05918-340001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2007

/Brett A. Krueger/
Brett A. Krueger
Reg. No. 54,243

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21530401.doc

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

1. A touch fastener component having a sheet-form base and an array of fastener elements, each fastener element comprising:

a stem extending outwardly from and integrally with the sheet-form base, and

two heads extending in essentially opposite directions in an engagement plane from a distal end of the stem to corresponding tips, each head having a lower surface forming a crook for retaining loops, the fastener element having an upper surface that defines a well between the heads;

wherein a height of a lowermost extent of the well, measured from and perpendicular to the sheet-form base, is less than 60 percent of an overall height of the fastener element, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base.

2. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the height of the lowermost extent of the well is at least about 70 percent of an overall height of one of the two oppositely-directed heads, measured perpendicular to the base from the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head.

3. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein each fastener element has an overall length between opposite extents of the heads, measured parallel to the base, of at least 1.8 times the overall height of the fastener element.

5. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein a ratio of an overall height of each crook, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip

to an uppermost extent of the crook, to an entrance height measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base below a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip, is greater than 0.6.

6. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein an overall height of one of the two oppositely-directed heads, measured perpendicular to the base from the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head, is less than 60 percent of the overall height of the fastener element.

7. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein a ratio of an overall length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in the engagement plane, to the height of the lowermost extent of the well, is greater than 2.5.

8. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein each fastener element has a mold release factor, defined as a ratio of a difference between a minimum solid length of the stem, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view, and a maximum solid length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view above an elevation corresponding to the minimum solid length, to the minimum solid length of the stem, of less than 0.1.

9. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein at least one of the heads has an overall height, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head, that is greater than half of an overall height of the fastener element, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base.

10. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the tips extend toward the base.

11. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the lower surfaces of the heads are arched.

12. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the heads and stem form a unitary molded structure.

13. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the heads have surfaces of resin cooled against mold surfaces.

14. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the stem has opposing surfaces defined by severed resin.

15. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the stem and heads have side surfaces lying in parallel planes.

16. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the crooks overhang surfaces of the stem.

17. The touch fastener component of claim 16 wherein the crooks overhang stem surfaces that extend at an inclination angle of between about 20 and 30 degrees with respect to a normal to the base.

24. The touch fastener component of claim 1 further comprising a backing material laminated to a side of the base opposite the fastener elements.

25. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the fastener elements are arranged in a density of at least 350 fastener elements per square inch of the base.

26. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the fastener elements together cover at least 20 percent of an overall surface area of the base from which the fastener elements extend.

27. A touch fastener component having a sheet-form base and an array of fastener elements, each fastener element comprising:

a stem extending outwardly from and integrally with the sheet-form base, and

two heads disposed at a distal end of the stem and extending in essentially opposite directions in an engagement plane to corresponding tips, each head having a lower surface forming a crook for retaining loops, the fastener element having an upper surface that defines a well between the heads;

wherein a ratio of an overall height of at least one of the heads, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the tip to an uppermost extent of the head, to a height of a lowermost extent of the well, measured from and perpendicular to the sheet-form base, is greater than 0.7.

28. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein each fastener element has an overall length between opposite extents of the heads, measured parallel to the base, of at least 1.8 times an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the base.

30. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein a ratio of an overall height of each crook, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip to an uppermost extent of the crook, to an entrance height measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base below a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip, is greater than 0.6.

31. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein the overall height of one of the two oppositely-directed heads is less than 60 percent of an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the base.

32. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein a ratio of an overall length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in the engagement plane, to the height of the lowermost extent of the well, is greater than 2.5.

33. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein each fastener element has a mold release factor, defined as a ratio of a difference between a minimum solid length of the stem, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view, and a maximum solid length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view above an elevation corresponding to the minimum solid length, to the minimum solid length of the stem, of less than 0.1.

34. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein at least one of the heads has an overall height that is greater than half of an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the sheet-form base.

35. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein the tips extend toward the base.

36. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein the crooks overhang surfaces of the stem.

37. The touch fastener component of claim 36 wherein the crooks overhang stem surfaces that extend at an inclination angle of between about 20 and 30 degrees with respect to a normal to the base.

45. The touch fastener component of claim 27 further comprising a backing material laminated to a side of the base opposite the fastener elements.

46. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein the fastener elements are arranged in a density of at least 350 fastener elements per square inch of the base.

47. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein the fastener elements together cover at least 20 percent of an overall surface area of the base from which the fastener elements extend.

48. A touch fastener component having a sheet-form base and an array of fastener elements, each fastener element comprising:

a stem extending outwardly from and integrally with the sheet-form base, and

two heads disposed at a distal end of the stem and extending in essentially opposite directions in an engagement plane to corresponding tips, each head having a lower surface forming a crook for retaining loops, the fastener element having an upper surface that defines a well between the heads;

wherein a ratio of an overall length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in the engagement plane between opposite extents of the heads, to a height of a lowermost extent of the well, measured from and perpendicular to the sheet-form base, is greater than 2.5.

49. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein the overall length of the fastener element is at least 1.8 times an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the base.

50. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein a ratio of an overall height of each crook, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip to an uppermost extent of the crook, to an entrance height measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base below a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip, is greater than 0.6.

51. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein an overall height of one of the two oppositely-directed heads, measured perpendicular to the base from the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head, is less than 60 percent of an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the base.

52. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein each fastener element has a mold release factor, defined as a ratio of a difference between a minimum solid length of the stem, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view, and a maximum solid length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view above an elevation corresponding to the minimum solid length, to the minimum solid length of the stem, of less than 0.1.

53. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein at least one of the heads has an overall height, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head, that is greater than half of an overall height of the fastener element, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base.

54. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein the crooks overhang surfaces of the stem.

55. The touch fastener component of claim 54 wherein the crooks overhang stem surfaces that extend at an inclination angle of between about 20 and 30 degrees with respect to a normal to the base.

60. The touch fastener component of claim 48 further comprising a backing material laminated to a side of the base opposite the fastener elements.

61. A touch fastener component having a sheet-form base and an array of fastener elements, each fastener element comprising:

a molded stem extending outwardly from and integrally with the sheet-form base, and

two heads disposed at a distal end of the stem and extending in essentially opposite directions in an engagement plane to corresponding tips, each head having a lower surface forming a crook for retaining loops, the fastener element having an upper surface that defines a well between the heads;

wherein each fastener element has a mold release factor, defined as a ratio of a difference between a minimum solid length of the stem, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view, and a maximum solid length of the fastener element, measured parallel to the sheet-form base in side view above an elevation corresponding to the minimum solid length, to the minimum solid length of the stem, of less than 0.1.

62. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein the mold release factor is less than 0.05.

63. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein the overall length of the fastener element is at least 1.8 times an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the base.

64. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein a ratio of an overall height of each crook, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip to an uppermost extent of the crook, to an entrance height measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base below a lowermost extent of the corresponding tip, is greater than 0.6.

65. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein an overall height of one of the two oppositely-directed heads, measured perpendicular to the base from the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head, is less than 60 percent of an overall height of the fastener element, measured from and perpendicular to the base.

66. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein at least one of the heads has an overall height, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base from a lowermost extent of the tip of the head to an uppermost extent of the head, that is greater than half of an overall height of the fastener element, measured perpendicular to the sheet-form base.

67. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein the crooks overhang surfaces of the stem.

68. The touch fastener component of claim 67 wherein the crooks overhang stem surfaces that extend at an inclination angle of between about 20 and 30 degrees with respect to a normal to the base.

76. The touch fastener component of claim 1 wherein the height of the fastener element is measured at a molded upper surface of the fastener element.

77. The touch fastener component of claim 27 wherein the height of the fastener element is measured at a molded upper surface of the fastener element.

78. The touch fastener component of claim 48 wherein the height of the fastener element is measured at a molded upper surface of the fastener element.

79. The touch fastener component of claim 61 wherein the height of the fastener element is measured at a molded upper surface of the fastener element.